

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 were pending at the time of examination. In this Amendment, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 9 and 17, and cancelled claim 20 from further consideration in this application. The Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1, 9, 17 and 20 prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1, 9 and 17 were amended and claim 20 was cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the application. The Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1, 9, 17 and 20, as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C § 101 as being directed to non-statutory matter. As noted above, the Applicant has cancelled claim 20 from further consideration in this application, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,542,908 B1 to Ims (hereinafter “Ims”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,369,821 B1 to Merrill et al. (hereinafter “Merrill”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The first step of claim 1 requires “creating a session-specific Application Program Interface on the server side for a server-side software method.” The Examiner contends that this is shown in Ims, col. 11, line 65. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Application Program Interface (API) referred to in the cited section of Ims is a “security API...in use by the client browser” and not an API used on the server side for a server-side software method, as required by claim 1. The API described in Ims is described in the context of “examples of other information that may be useful for customizing an archive file to reflect attributes of the client workstation environment” (col. 11, lines 61-63), that is, the API describes features of the client and not of the server. It should be noted that this is the only section of Ims that describes any API whatsoever.

As has been discussed in previous Office Action responses, the session-specific, server-side API recited in claim 1 is essential to the invention, as registering different methods of a Java

bean for different client sessions enables different clients to access different subsets of the methods from the same bean class on the server through different APIs. This is very useful, both in terms of security, and flexibility for the system. Ims does not show such flexibility. Instead, when a client application in Ims encounters an <APPLET> tag during execution, a message is sent to an archive builder application on the web server, which builds, on-demand, a bean proxy to be included in an archive file. The archive file is then sent to the client, where the archive file is unpacked and where the proxy executes as a proxy for the actual bean instance. When the bean's execution method is invoked by the application, the proxy's execution method is generated to know that it must request remote execution from a server. This remote execution uses a generic client application, and the result of the remote execution is returned to the proxy, which then passes the results on to the client application (col. 10, line 35 – col. 11, line 7). Thus, while Ims provides a mechanism for executing remote methods that are not located on the client, this is done on an on-demand, and no mechanisms are provided for restricting clients as to which methods they are allowed to request, as is made possible by the session-specific server-side API, as recited in claim 1.

In order to further clarify these differences, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to further recite that the script language program is "unique to the client-side data processing system," thus making it clear that different client-side data processing systems can receive different interpreted script language programs, based on what information (e.g., beans and methods within the respective beans) the respective client-side data processing systems should be allowed to access. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0025]-[0037] of the specification. Thus, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 17 contains similar limitations and were rejected for substantially the same reasons as claim 1. The Applicant has made similar amendments to claim 17 as to claim 1, and submits that at least for the reasons that were discussed above with respect to claim 1, the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2 and 3 depend directly from claim 1 and contain further distinguishing limitations. Thus, for at least reasons substantially similar to those set forth above, the Applicant respectfully contends that the rejection of claims 2 and 3 is unsupported by the cited art and should be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,230,160 B1 to Chan et al. (hereinafter “Chan”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,990,653 B1 to Burd et al. (hereinafter “Burd”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As was discussed above, the second step of claim 1, as amended, recites:

“automatically creating an interpreted script language program that is unique to the client-side data processing system and contains calls to the server-side software method in accordance with the session-specific Application Program Interface;”

Respectfully, neither Chan nor Burd shows automatic creation of an interpreted script language program, such as a JavaScript file that is created for each unique combination of bean and bean methods to be delivered to the client in order to control which server-side methods the client will be able to access on each exposed bean.

Chan shows, similar to Ims, creation of “client-side-server-proxies,” which are representations of the server beans that will continue to exist on the client side once the server bean is remotely distributed and will be used in method access and event generation activities. However, Chan does not discuss generation of different proxies for different clients, or restrictions for certain clients to access only certain beans/methods, which is enabled by the Applicant’s invention, as defined in claim 1.

Burd is cited to disclose the limitation of “sending the created interpreted script language program to the client side.” Even though this might be accurate, Burd does not provide any further information that would cure the deficiencies of Chan, since Burd does not discuss what type of information (i.e., what script) is sent to the client, but only how the script is delivered. For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

As was mentioned above, independent claim 17 contains similar limitations and were rejected for substantially the same reasons as claim 1. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that at least for reasons similar to the reasons that were discussed above with respect to claim 1, the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-16 and 18-19 depend directly from claims 1 and 17, respectively, and contain further distinguishing limitations. Thus, for at least reasons substantially similar to

those set forth above, the Applicant respectfully contends that the rejection of claims 2-16 and 18-19 is unsupported by the cited art and should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, with respect to the rejection of claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), which adds Ims to the Chan/Burd combination, the Applicant would like to point out that Ims is an improper reference for this type of rejection, since both Ims and the current invention were at the time the invention was made, both owned by or subject to an obligation of assignment to International Business Machines, Inc. The Chan/Burd combination has been addressed above for claims 14-16. Again, it is respectfully submitted that claims 14-16 are allowable over the art of record.

### **Conclusion**

The Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
MOLLBORN PATENTS

/Fredrik Mollborn/

Fredrik Mollborn  
Reg. No. 48,587

2840 Colby Drive  
Boulder, CO 80305  
(303) 459-4527